

**Press Conference**  
**Under Secretary Nicholas Burns,**  
**November 1, 2007**  
**at the Hotel Ambassador, Vienna, Austria**

*Moderator:* Good morning. Ambassador Burns, as you all know, has only a few minutes, so he's going to speak first and Ambassador Strohal will speak subsequent to him. That will give you more time with both Ambassador Burns and Ambassador Strohal. So without further ado...

*Ambassador Burns:* Thank you very much and thank you for coming out on what I know is All Saints Day, a religious holiday here in Austria. It's a pleasure to be here. I'm in Vienna for three purposes. The first is to meet with Dr. Mohamed ElBaradei later this morning, the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency, and I'm looking forward to that meeting very much to discuss a variety of issues, most notably Iran and the preoccupation, of course, that all of us have to see that Iran does not proceed to produce nuclear capability. The United States has felt for a very long time that Iran should cease and desist its efforts to enrich uranium and its plan.... We have helped to sponsor three Security Council Resolutions between July of 2006 and March of 2007. We are now working on a third Chapter XII Security Council Resolution. In fact, I'll be participating in a meeting in London tomorrow with the five countries and Germany to that effect. We spoke last week, the United States with Secretary of State Rice and Secretary Paulson, about new American sanctions on Iran, on the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps, on the Quds Force, and on three Iranian banks, as well as some various state agencies and individuals. I look forward to talking to Dr. ElBaradei about the work of the IAEA which is important work, but also how it can be combined with the work of the United Nations Security Council so that all of us can work to see that Iran does not proceed with its nuclear ambitions.

Second, I had a chance last evening to meet a variety of people here in Vienna, including Antonio Costa who is in charge of United Nations narcotics control efforts in Afghanistan. We had a very good session on Afghanistan. I also met the State Secretary of Austria, Dr. Winkler. We also had the opportunity to talk about some of the issues before our two governments and I was very pleased to meet him.

Third, I just had a meeting with Mr. Strohal who is, of course, the head of ODIHR, which is a very important agency of the OSCE in charge of election monitoring. That agency has a very proud history and a very important and positive one. It has been observing elections in all of our countries including my own country, the United States during our last presidential election in 2004, and we are very supportive of his work. We met because we'll be meeting in Madrid in about a month's time for the OSCE Ministerial. We would like to strengthen the work of ODIHR; we'd like to see that work not only respected, but also supported and my country, of course, is a very strong supporter of that work.

So those are the three reasons for which I am in Vienna. I apologize for the brevity of this press conference but I have three other meetings this morning. But I'll be happy to take any questions you might have.

*Question: Will you tell us if the United States will actively oppose the Russian proposal to in the future restrict the election monitoring of the OHDIR in Europe and how do you think the debate's going to unfold up to the Ministerial Council?*

Burns: Thank you very much. I believe there are two issues here. One is for the Madrid Ministerial. There has been a proposal by a number of countries to, in essence, change the way that ODIHR does business and in our view, that proposal is quite negative and we will certainly not support it. I think our judgment would be that the great majority of countries probably would not support that proposal for the Madrid conference which will be held in a month's time.

Secondly, Dr. Strohal did inform me, and I heard something of this when I arrived in Vienna last night, that the Russian government has replied to his request for election monitoring, and Dr. Strohal advised me this morning that that proposal was quite limited - for quite limited OSCE representation. We regret very much this decision by the Russian authorities because it's rather unprecedented in the history of the OSCE and the history of ODIHR itself. All of our countries have submitted ourselves, including my own country, to full election observation by ODIHR, so we hope that the OSCE and Russia, ODIHR and Russia, might be able to work on this and discuss it and we hope that Russia will be open to a more full observation by the ODIHR and the OSCE because that has been the tradition going back many years now. I remember the Budapest Summit of December 1994. Important decisions were made at that Summit meeting that President Clinton intended in 1994 for the United States. Both our Administrations, President Clinton's and now President Bush's over the last seven years, have been wholly supportive of those efforts, so we did have a conversation about that.

*Question: I have a question about Turkish-Iraq relations. How long will the US give the Turkish army to deal with the PKK in Iraq?*

Burns: Well, I know that our government - and Secretary Rice - has been very clear; - as you know she'll be going to Turkey in just a few days. We fully sympathize with the fact that Turkey has...the Turkish government and the Turkish people have faced a vicious set of attacks by the PKK. I believe that more than 50 Turkish citizens - soldiers and civilians - have been killed in cross-border attacks in the last month. That, of course, is reprehensible. We fully sympathize with the Turkish government and the Turkish people. We classify the PKK as a terrorist organization and we have since the mid-1990s. We urge all countries not to allow the PKK to establish political front operations in their capitals. There are still some European countries that allow the PKK this type of representation. In the meantime, as you know, we have been working with the Turkish government, as well as the Iraqi government, including the Kurdish regional government, to try to convince the Iraqi government and the Kurdish regional government to make sure every effort is being made to convince the PKK to pull back from the border and every effort is being made by the Iraqi-Kurdish authorities to see that these kinds of attacks will stop. So it's a major issue for us. We're sympathetic to Turkey. We, of course, would not want Turkey to launch its own military operation across the border because obviously there are troubles enough in Iraq. We would like to see that prevented, but it is absolutely imperative that steps be taken to prevent such PKK attacks in the future. I know that Secretary Rice will be discussing this when she is in Istanbul in just a little while.

*Question: My question is, there's been some US criticism about Dr. ElBaradei for exceeding his mandate and speaking more strongly about Iran not having a nuclear weapons initiative.. Is there a specific message you will be giving him?*

Burns: Well, yes, thank you very much for that question. I would say this, that obviously he is a person of great distinction, and the role he is playing is quite important, because his agency, of course, oversees some of the most difficult and complex issues in the world. Iran's nuclear program, I think Dr. ElBaradei. and the case of India has been very positive and very helpful and to the Indian government as well as all of us who wish to see the civil nuclear agreement between the United States and India go forward. On the question of Iran, however, while the role of the IAEA is very important, while it's important to look into questions concerning Iran's activities in the past, which is principally what Dr. ElBaradei. is doing is important, that's important, it is also important that the role of the Security Council be respected and in that vein, we believe, that the Security Council has spoken, and when the Security Council passes a Chapter XII resolution it is obligatory that all member states of the United Nations follow that resolution. In July 1996 the Security Council spoke and said that Iran should suspend its enrichment activities at Natanz, enrichment and reprocessing activities. On Dec 23 of 2006 we passed the first Chapter XII resolution and on March 24, 2007, passed the second Chapter XII resolution. So three resolutions, two of Chapter XII variety, in over one year. It's important that everyone support the Security Council resolutions, and Dr. ElBaradei. has made statements in the past that would seem to indicate that sanctions might not work, or that enrichment is not going to be suspended, and obviously, as co-author of those Security Council resolutions, we take some issue with that and so we respect him, we will work with him we certainly support what he's doing with Iran in the IAEA context, but in order to achieve a resolution of this problem we are going to need the efforts of both the IAEA and the U.N. Security Council, and we think that the efforts of both have to be respected. And they have to in essence be tied together. And I don't think it's right to think one is more important than the other, they are both important. And that's certainly a point that we have made in the past to the IAEA and to Dr. ElBaradei we'll make it again. We wish him luck and we wish him success in his work with Iran because if he's successful, that means that Iran will finally begin to answer questions about P1 and P2 centrifuge research and the other activities that they did not report to the IAEA for a very long period of time.

*Question: Can I just ask, do you think he's not getting the message? And that there might be an element of friction?*

Burns: Oh, I didn't say that at all. I said rather than say that one organization is a totality of the efforts both organizations are important and we need to see both of them move forward, and I think the real problem here is not Dr. ElBaradei and not the United States, or any other country - it's Iran. Iran is the country that has not complied either with its IAEA obligations or with its Security Council obligations. Iran is a member state of the United Nations and therefore Iran has an obligation to suspend enrichment because that's what the Security Council has said. Twice under Chapter 7 and 3 times in total. So I look forward to a very good and in depth discussion with him. Our hope would be the following: our hope is that a third Security Council resolution will be passed as soon as possible, in New York, a

sanctions resolution under Chapter 7. Second, we would very much support seeing the European Union go forward with further sanctions against Iran. Third, we think that the major trading partners of Iran should reduce their trade in order to send a message to Iran that it's not business as usual. And our view is that all of that should happen as soon as possible, so that Iran gets the message that as long it's defying the Security Council, which it currently is, and not cooperating fully with the IAEA, which is my understanding that it currently is not cooperating, then it's very important that we send this message that there is going to be a price to what Iran does. And that price will be increased isolation and heightened sanctions. Our view is that we've offered negotiations to Iran. Secretary Rice, last Thursday, reaffirmed the wish of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Russia and China, along with Germany that all of us are willing to negotiate. Secretary Rice said that she would be at the negotiating table and any issue could be on the table. Iran has turned that offer down at least 3 times. In June 2006 after we made the offer here in Vienna. In June 2007, when it was reaffirmed to Iran by Javier Solana. And last Tuesday in Rome when Javier Solana met with this new joint negotiating team, Jalili and Lararjani, they did not accept the offer to negotiate. And we were very clear here in Vienna on June 1, 2006, when the offer was first made, that if Iran could not accept the offer to negotiate, if Iran would not accept the offer to have us help provide electricity production through civil nuclear power in Iran, and the P5 said we'd help to provide that to Iran, then there would be sanctions. And so that's the choice that Iran has made. Iran has chosen the route of sanctions. We hope that Iran will reconsider, suspend its enrichment program and come to negotiations with the United States and with the other countries of the Permanent 5 members of the Security Council. That offer is on the table, but Iran continues to refuse it. And I think that's the relevant, salient point that has to be made about this Iran issue these days.

*Question: Secretary Burns, I just heard you say, I think I understood, ...that you, as far as you understand it Iran is still not cooperating fully with the IAEA. Are you suggesting, do I understand correctly, that you're getting information that Iran's implementation of the work plan is not followed through ... by this point ...*

Burns: That interim judgment is going to be made by the IAEA and Dr. ElBaradei but it has not yet been made. There's been no report issued. In the meantime, let me give you one example. We know that Iran has told the IAEA for many years that it is not engaged and has not been engaged in P2 centrifuge research, but I also remember, we all remember, you remember, the statement of President Ahmadinejad, a public statement he made last year that Iran was engaged in P2 centrifuge research. So which is it? Is the President of Iran correct that they are violating their IAEA commitment by being engaged in P2 centrifuge research? Or is what the Iranians say to the IAEA in private meetings correct? It's an interesting question. It's put a lot of doubts in people's minds. Plus the fact that they did not come clean with the IAEA for a great number of years on their secret research activities that were then revealed some years later. This has instilled a lot of doubts in people's minds. And so the IAEA has a part of the effort, but the United Nations Security Council, which of course is one of the supreme, multilateral, international bodies, has a very important responsibility here. And we've decided in that Council, by very large margins, some unanimous votes and some nearly unanimous, that Iran should be sanctioned. And the point of the sanctions is to convince the Iranians that the way forward here is a

peaceful resolution of this dispute through diplomacy, but they've got to come to the negotiating table willing to answer questions honestly about their nuclear research which we don't believe that Iran has done for a great number of years.

*Question: If Dr. ElBaradei gives Iran a clean bill of health in this interim report, would that be enough to forestall sanctions?*

Burns: I think that the P5 ministers said in Sept. 28 in New York that they wanted to hear from Dr. ElBaradei, but also Dr. Javier Solana. And so if Iran has not suspended its enrichment program in Natanz by a couple weeks time, that's going to be a highly relevant factor for us. That means they will not have met their Security Council obligations, so both of these reports are going to be important and I don't know what Dr. ElBaradei is going to say. That's his business, and his right to issue his own report, but there's also another report issued by Dr. Solana. And since we're a member, a permanent member, of the Security Council, we're going to put great credence in whether or not Iran has met the conditions of a Security Council. What did we say in Security Council Resolution 1747 that we passed on March 24 of this year? We said that if within 60 days of March 24, if Iran had not fully suspended its enrichment and reprocessing activities, that the Security Council would sanction Iran again. Well, that didn't happen. On May 24, when those 60 days were up, we agreed to a brief period of time before the G8 summit when Dr. Solana would try to convince Iran to negotiate. Iran said no. And now we've seen Russia and China effectively blocking a third resolution since then. So, our judgment is that if Iran has not suspended in the next couple of weeks, well, our view will be, I'm sure, that that's not sufficient, that that will not be full cooperation with the Security Council. In fact, it will be a refutation, a refusal of Iran, to meet the requirements of the Security Council. And as a permanent member of the Security Council we think the will of the United Nations and the credibility of the United Nations needs to be upheld.

So it's a great pleasure to be with you. I apologize: I have meetings to go to. And thank you very much for coming. And have a good day.

Nov. 1, 2007 Vienna